

much lower range of 14 to 65 percent. Such a cut in individual rates, combined with the proposed corporate rate reduction, would total \$13.6 billion. The rate cuts may, of course, be somewhat revised in the bill that emerges from the House Ways and Means Committee. But I am confident that the net tax reduction will not be far from the proposed \$10.3 billion.

The impact of that overall tax cut will be felt throughout the economy far faster than most people realize. If the President's program were to receive final approval by October 1st, the entire \$10 billion in tax relief would be released into the economy within the following 15 months. The ultimate effect would be several times \$10 billion—as evidenced by the report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, which estimated that it would eventually increase our annual Gross National Product by as much as \$40 billion.

It would be a mistake, however, to measure the effectiveness of the overall tax program in dollar terms alone. For in the final analysis, what it will mean is more and better job and educational opportunities for millions of our citizens, greater profitability, productivity, and incentives for business and business investment, and increased Government revenues to provide for our growing national needs without risking large deficits.

The question of Federal expenditures and deficits has loomed large in public discussion of the President's tax proposals. I would like to devote some time to it today, for it is a question that has too often been beclouded with misunderstanding.

First of all, let me say that the reason we have had large deficits in recent years—either in this or in preceding administrations—is not because of excessive or unnecessary spending by the Federal Government. The real reason is simply that our economy has not been operating at levels high enough to produce the revenues we need to meet the demands of our rapidly growing population and the increased costs of defense and space.

Let us look at some of the facts involved in the issue of expenditure control: One very elementary point—which too many choose to ignore—was made by President Eisenhower in his 1960 budget message, and I quote:

"We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

The Director of the Budget, Kermit Gordon has provided some very telling examples of this population rise and of its impact on Federal services: By the end of fiscal 1964, the budget year on which we are now working, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. Between fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the volume of mail will rise by more than 6 percent, the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions by 10 percent, beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program by 16 percent. Those are by no means all the figures one could cite, but they are enough to make the simple point that we are a growing nation which requires growing national services to meet

the needs of its people and of its business and its industry.

President Kennedy, without neglecting essential national needs, has exercised, is exercising, and will continue to exercise a firm control over expenditures. Our budget has increased rapidly over the past 3 years, but fully 70 percent of the total increase from 1961 through 1964 has been in the areas of defense, space, and the inescapable interest on the public debt. When you include the 1964 Budget as submitted by the President, then—apart from defense and space—the total increase in all expenditures during the first 3 years of his administration will be \$800 million less than the similar increase during the preceding 3 years from 1958 to 1961.

The facts are there for those who are willing to recognize them. I have no quarrel with those who do scrutinize the facts and who, after intelligent examination, pinpoint where they think cuts can be made. But seldom has any single issue generated so much loose and spend-thrift oratory as this matter of Government expenditures. It is hardly responsible, fiscally or otherwise, to pluck from the blue air—or from the nostalgic past—some arbitrary figure and proclaim it as the magic limit expenditures must never exceed, or as the exact amount expenditures must be cut.

Some who are seriously and honestly concerned with fiscal integrity are currently suggesting that fiscal 1964 expenditures should not exceed the fiscal 1963 level. That suggestion, I am afraid, is completely out of touch with the realities of fiscal life and national needs. The truth is that the entire \$4.5 billion budget increase from 1963 to 1964 can be accounted for by increases in only three areas: defense, space, and interest on the public debt. The total of all other expenditures is being held below 1963 levels.

To reduce the total fiscal 1964 budget to the 1963 level would call for cutting defense and space expenditures by \$4.5 billion, or cutting a similar amount from all other programs—which have already been held below their 1963 level—or some combination of the two.

The impracticability of such an arbitrary cut becomes apparent when one realizes that while the administration presents the budget and Congress considers it on an annual basis, the programs whose cost is expressed in the budget are in large part continuing programs which involve not only plans but commitments for years ahead. For example, over 40 percent of the fiscal 1964 expenditure budget involves payments from unspent authorizations enacted in previous years, most of which are already obligated. And there are other items—such as veterans pensions—which, while they are in a somewhat different category, are inherently contractual in nature.

Let us look at specifics: Where would you cut the budget to reduce fiscal 1964 expenditures by \$4.5 billion?

The \$4.5 billion increase was in space, defense, and interest on the public debt. Suppose you tried to cut the defense budget by

\$4.5 billion, where would you look first? Research and development costs \$7.1 billion, so you would have to cut that more than in half. Procurement costs \$16.4 billion, most of which represents payments on contracts already far along and funded out of earlier appropriations. Therefore, budget cuts here would have little effect in 1964, but rather in 1965 or even later. To reduce procurement expenditures in fiscal 1964 we would have to severely stretch our programs already underway and funded by appropriations which have already been made.

Expenditures for maintaining our standing defense forces at home and abroad total \$25.9 billion. This amount is funded from the current budget, so it is here that we must cut if we wish to hold 1964 expenditures to 1963 levels. A cut of one-sixth in this area would provide almost \$4.5 billion. But it would mean reducing the Army by more than two divisions—more than twice the total increase in manpower since this administration took office, reducing the Navy by more than 140 ships, reducing the Air Force by 14 combat wings, and so on right down the line. I doubt if there are many Americans who would favor such a course.

The same thing applies to the space budget. Here, the National Association of Manufacturers has suggested a cut of \$1.4 billion in the \$5.7 billion of new spending authority requested by the President. But even if such a drastic cut were made, it would only reduce actual 1964 expenditures by a little over \$500 million.

My point is not that the budget cannot be cut, but simply that it cannot be cut arbitrarily or fitted into a fixed mold such as the 1963 expenditure total. We must not forget either that the fiscal 1964 budget is an extremely tight budget—one of the tightest ever proposed. It has already been cut—and hugely—by the administration itself. Since January, the President has reduced his fiscal 1964 requests by some \$615 million. Before that, a full \$19 billion was trimmed from agency requests.

In the final analysis, the only real solution for our recent large budget deficits is to increase our economic growth to the point where it will produce enough revenues to finance, within the context of a balanced budget, the minimum programs required to meet our national needs at home and abroad. Not only will substantial tax reduction in 1963 help generate that growth, but—as the President has repeatedly pledged—a large portion of the increased revenues that result will be applied toward eliminating the current deficit.

This is the positive approach to the budget issue—the approach that can help us to achieve our potential as a Nation, both in economic and human terms. Prompt and substantial tax reduction will, of course, greatly increase the potential for American business. Even more important, it will greatly increase opportunity for all Americans. Finally, and perhaps most important of all, by strengthening our economy, it will increase the ability of our entire Nation to provide a better and more secure life for this generation and the generations to come.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 11: 28: Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

Almighty God, how gracious are Thy words of welcome, inviting us to come unto Thee and how precious are Thy promises unto all who call upon Thee in the fellowship of prayer.

In penitence we confess our sins and seek Thy pardoning grace; in heartfelt gratitude we praise Thee for our many blessings; in humility we renew our vows to serve Thee in love and loyalty.

Grant that in these strange and strenuous days the mind and heart of mankind may be redeemed from pride and prejudice and be restored to compassion and charity, to good will, and mutual trust.

Inspire and constrain us to look upon bruised and broken humanity with insight and sympathy and show us how we may give help and healing to all who

are carrying heavy burdens and wandering in ways that are dark and lonely.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 13, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 603. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the text of the bill (S. 74) entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer" with an amendment.

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the title of the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States Numbered 63-13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the body of the RECORD, and to include a letter from the President, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in two instances.

In fairness to the gentleman from Missouri, I will not submit those immediately, inasmuch as I have to be away for 2 weeks. I am asking this permission in order that I might submit them during my time of absence from the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the two extensions, in view of what I have previously stated.

DR. OLGA MARIE FERRER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the private bill of the Senate, S. 74, for the relief of certain aliens, and concur with the amendment of the Senate to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gutierrez

Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the title of the above-entitled bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I inquire of the gentleman if the Senate amendment is germane to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The amendment of the Senate is germane to the House amendment and to the original bill.

On May 7, 1963, the House passed S. 74 with an amendment adding to the bill the provisions of a bill previously passed by the House. Under the bill, S. 74, as amended, both beneficiaries of this legislation would be placed in a position to file petitions for naturalization. Both beneficiaries are physicians, doctors of medicine, who desire to practice their profession in the States of Florida and West Virginia, respectively. For licensing purposes they need the status of U.S. citizens. Both have been admitted lawfully for permanent residence.

The Senate added to the bill one more case approved by the committee. The beneficiary is being granted, under the amendment, the status of permanent residence, thus making him eligible for naturalization as the case is in the matter of two other beneficiaries of S. 74.

Mr. POFF. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING DISTRIBUTION OF LITERATURE BY CONGRESS CAN SAVE MONEY FOR TAXPAYERS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAYS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I made the same request last week and it was objected to on the Republican side, as was my first request in 15 years for a special order. It was my purpose to object to all 1-minute speeches, but I shall not, pending my next request for a 1-minute speech. But, if it is objected to on the Republican side, I shall object to every request

for a 1-minute speech from then on from that side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving money for the taxpayers, and there is not a Member here who is not so interested, I am sure, Congress could bring about an immediate saving of more than \$1 million if we eliminated the distribution of so-called free literature such as Agricultural Yearbooks, Farmers Bulletins, Infant Care, and other publications.

Of course, we all know this literature is not free and the Members who distribute it do not pay for it. It is paid for by the taxpayers. I am confident that such a demonstration of good faith on our part, by eliminating these publications, would meet with the approval of the majority of our constituents.

I made just a rough check on the cost of some of the literature and find it costs approximately \$213,000 to \$220,000 a year just to print the Agricultural Yearbook. The Department informs me there is probably another \$100,000 for complete financial analysis. Now, add to that the intangible costs of wrapping and mailing the Yearbooks from the House folding room and the cost of postage and you will see that the printing and distribution of the Yearbook alone would approximate a million dollars a year.

The Agricultural Bulletins, according to my information from the Department, come close to costing \$275,000 a year.

Infant Care is just one of the booklets issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and a gross round number figure on the cost comes close to \$119,000.

We can admit these are fine publications, but can we justify them as legitimate costs to the taxpayers? It seems to me we would be better to follow the example of an earlier Congress which eliminated the sending of free seeds to constituents, by eliminating free literature and permitting those who desire to purchase textbooks, library books, reference books and "how to" pamphlets to do so with their own money.

Even with the wide distribution given this literature, only a very small proportion of the people can get it, so free distribution through the offices of Members is discriminatory and unfair to those who must help pay the bill, but cannot get their share of the books and pamphlets being given away.

I invite others who are interested in saving money to join me in introducing legislation which will put an end to the practice.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include extraneous matter in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after all legislative business and other special orders heretofore granted, I be allowed to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think under the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing editorials are supposed to go in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. For that reason I would object to the inclusion of the editorials in connection with the gentleman's remarks in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that request and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include the material attached.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

HOOD COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to attend the 70th commencement exercises of Hood College in Frederick, Md., on June 9. During the conferring of degrees by President Elliott, of Hood College, honorary diplomas were given to Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, the researcher with the Food and Drug Administration, who was responsible for the public warnings about the dangers of thalidomide and to Dr. Muriel Meyers, an alumna of Hood College and now the associate director of the University of Michigan Simpson Memorial Institute for medical research.

A distinguished Member of the other body, the Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, spoke to the graduates and their guests on "The Meaning of Time." In his very insightful and learned remarks, Senator LAUSCHE reminded the academic convocation that although threats to the peace of the world seem insurmountable

today, the problem of man's survival is as old as history itself. Senator LAUSCHE told the graduates that "the marvelous present period is ours to do with it as we will. Many will do great things tomorrow, but tomorrow never comes. Delay is a tragic human failing and a failing of nations." The Senator concluded by urging each of the graduates to be aware of the opportunities which exist for public service and to seize the day, making the most of such opportunities.

I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to all 102 new alumnae of Hood College and in particular I would like to congratulate the honor graduates, R. Louise Fisher Waynant, summa cum laude, Helen Carol Joice, magna cum laude, and Lorraine Clara Gorrell, cum laude.

Hood College, of Frederick, Md., represents a unique experiment in the education of young women. The administration and faculty deserve the highest praise for the standards of excellence which they maintain in this all-important work of preparing these young women for the future.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUESTED

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, June 18, after the completion of the legislative business and all other special orders previously entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SALUTE TO BOY SCOUTS AND SCOUTMASTER W. W. COULSON OF WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, local, State, and National authorities today are concerned about the problems of juvenile delinquency. There also is discussion of establishing new agencies, financed by the Federal Government, to create outlets of activity for young people in metropolitan areas.

I would like to take a moment, however, to pay tribute to just one of the youth organizations in the United States which has done a monumental job in the development of good citizens. I speak of the Boy Scouts of America.

It was my privilege this morning to host 30 Eagle Scouts, all members of Troop 410, Fairview Christian Church, of Wichita, Kans. They are in Washington for a 4-day educational and sight-seeing tour. They have worked hard for 2 years to earn this trip.

I also want to salute Mr. W. W. Coulson, the scoutmaster of this troop, who has provided inspirational guidance and leadership to Boy Scouts for 33 years in Wichita. He is dedicated to Scouting and to his boys. He possesses a commendable record in volunteer Scout

work. Mr. Coulson, who will be 77 years old next month, has guided 175 boys to Scouting's highest rank of Eagle Scout. He has worked with them from the time they entered scouting as Tenderfoots until they attain the Eagle badge.

The city of Wichita, the State of Kansas, and these United States have benefited from the dedication and devotion of Mr. Coulson to his boys. He is representative of the thousands of men and women who volunteer their time toward building young men who are thoroughly prepared—educationally, morally, and spiritually—to assume the responsibilities of good citizenship.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

U.S. SHOULD CUT DIPLOMATIC TIES WITH HAITI

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Haiti's anti-American President Francois Duvalier has demanded that the United States recall its Ambassador to Haiti, and has already recalled his own Ambassador to underscore his demands.

Coupled with Duvalier's recent harassment of U.S. citizens, this new turn in U.S. relations with Haiti points up one hard fact—that the United States should suspend its diplomatic ties with the Duvalier regime.

Furthermore, the American people have had the impression that U.S. aid to Haiti has been suspended. I am informed that this is not so. Under the U.S. food-for-peace program, Haiti last year received some \$1.3 million in U.S. surplus foodstuffs subsidized by the U.S. taxpayer. Haiti also received last year some \$1.3 million from the United States as part of a grant to finance a malaria control project.

And at present Haiti is free to market over 40,000 tons of sugar in the United States, and at the present prevailing price of sugar in New York last Friday, which was \$152 per ton, Haiti could expect an income of \$6,166,488 this year if its U.S. sales continued.

This aid should be cut as well. Positive actions, such as these, would do much to strengthen our position in the Caribbean and the rest of the hemisphere as well.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AND CHIEFS OF STAFF AT VA MEDICAL INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BACK PAY ACT OF 1963

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4837) to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to observe I intend to object to all of the procedures under unanimous consent as they come along. I have been denied the right to have a special order and I have been denied the right to place information in the RECORD which I believe is of importance. I think until such time as the watchdogs of the House agree to some type of ruling that the procedures of the House are going to have to be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO MARKET POWER GENERATED AT AMISTAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4062) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande

to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

INCREASING PER DIEM AND SUBSISTENCE, AND LIMIT MILEAGE ALLOWANCES OF GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5905) to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEASE OF TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5930) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE 1963 TOBACCO ALLOTMENT LEASES

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 403) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPAND AUTHORITY OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3050) to expand the authority of the Canal Zone Government to settle claims not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3999) to amend section 66 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NURSES AS STAFF OFFICERS IN U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPEALING THE INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2876) to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from California if the gentleman's unanimous-consent request is made on the basis of his announcement of a moment ago and not because he objects to some provision of the proposed bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my sole purpose is directed to the fact that we have degenerated into a juvenile children's hour of denying the various Members to run their own household and place documents and other matters in the RECORD which they feel they should place in the RECORD, and to have special orders.

Mr. Speaker, I object to it on that ground only and not on the merits of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6012) to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 969) to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMEND INLAND AND WESTERN RIVER RULES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1036) to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and for signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LIMIT PRIORITY OF TAXES IN BANKRUPTCY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and non-dischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RELATING TO DUTIES OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4818) to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MERGING OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD APPROPRIATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 73) to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULES OF NAVIGATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 75) to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may permit vessels desiring to navigate or operate under bridges constructed over navigable waters of the United States to temporarily lower any lights, day signals, or other navigational means and appliances prescribed or required pursuant to law, rule, or regulation, and, if necessary, may authorize vessels so navigating or operating to depart from the rules to prevent collisions as prescribed by law, rule, or regulation. The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may also prescribe such special regulations to be observed by vessels so navigating or operating as in his judgment the public safety may require for the prevention of collisions.

(b) Notice of the regulations to accomplish the purposes of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register and in the Notice to Mariners, and after the effective date specified in such notices, such regulations shall have the force of law.

(c) Any person who navigates or operates a vessel in violation of the regulations established pursuant to this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500. In addition, any vessel navigated or operated in violation of the regulations established pursuant to this section shall be liable to a penalty of \$500, for which sum such vessel may be seized and proceeded against, by way of libel, in the district court of the United States for any district within which such vessel may be found.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PART II, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4157) to enact part II of the District of Co-

lumbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the only purpose I reserve the right here is to ask if there is not some way by which we can dispense with the printing of the bill. It would cost quite a lot of money to print the bill. I am asking for that permission to waive its printing.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, we plan to make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, § 11-505(b) (7), fourth line, strike out "Court" and insert "Courts".

Page 6, § 11-506(a), first line, strike out "Court" and insert "courts".

Page 30, § 11-1557(1), first line, strike out "section" and insert "sections".

Page 130, § 16-1314(b), fourth line, strike out "for" and insert "fee".

Page 163, Analysis of Chapter 29:

In heading of section 16-2922, after "widow" insert "or widower".

In heading of section 16-2924, after "widow's" insert "or widower's".

Strike out heading of section 16-2926.

Page 164, § 16-2921:

Second and third lines, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Fifth line, strike out "widow's".

Seventh line, strike out "commissioners" and insert "commissioners".

Tenth line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Twelfth line, insert "or man" after "woman".

Thirteenth line, strike out "bonds" and insert "bounds".

Page 164, § 16-2922:

First line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Second and third lines, insert "or her" after "his".

Page 164, § 16-2923, fourth line, strike out "wife's".

Page 164, § 16-2924, second line, insert "or widower" after "widow" and "or he" after "she".

Page 165, § 16-2924:

First and second lines, strike out "her" and insert "the".

Third line, insert "or he" after "she".

Fourth line, strike out "from her" and insert "of the".

Fifth line, strike out "her dower, and shall allow her," and insert "the dower, and shall allow her or him,".

Sixth line, strike out "her" and insert "the".

Eighth line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Page 165, § 16-2925, fifth line, strike out "by the wife".

Page 165, § 16-2926, strike out the entire section.

Page 168, § 16-3111, first line, insert before the first word "With respect to the trial of issues in the Probate Court, including the taking and use of testimony of nonresident widowers, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, unless otherwise provided by law, are applicable thereto."

Page 178, § 16-3902, ninth line, insert "not" before "available".

Page 186, § 17-303(b), first line, strike out "be" and insert "by".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought there was a request to be made that would estop the printing of this bill and save the taxpayers some \$4,000 or \$5,000.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Iowa, and I ask unanimous consent that the printing of this bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF SECTION 221 MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORITY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.J. Res. 467) amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fifth sentence of section 221(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 467 is a very simple measure which would keep one of FHA's programs going for another 2 years. In the Housing Act of 1954 we established section 221 to provide liberal mortgage financing under FHA insurance for families displaced by urban renewal or other Government activity. This program applies to both homeownership and rental housing. In the Housing Act of 1961 we broadened section 221 to make the benefits available to low- and moderate-income families generally. In the same act we put a 1965 cutoff date on most FHA programs, but this broadened authority under section 221 was made for only 2 years. Under existing law it would go back to being available only for displaced families after June 30 of this year. This resolution would extend this broadened eligibility to 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard no opposition whatsoever to this extension. In

the committee report—House Report No. 386—we included letters of endorsement from the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In addition, of course, it has the endorsement of the Federal Housing Administration. The committee has received a great number of letters from builders urging the extension of this program, and I know many of my colleagues have received similar letters. This resolution was reported out of the Subcommittee on Housing without a dissenting vote and was also reported unanimously by the full Banking Committee.

There are just two subsections of the FHA law which would be affected by this resolution. Section 221(d)(2) authorizes FHA mortgage insurance on both new and existing single-family homes in amounts up to \$11,000. There is the further provision that in the high-cost areas this may go up to \$15,000.

The maximum term is 35 years, except that where necessary to enable the home-buying family to qualify on the basis of monthly payments the FHA Commissioner may extend the maximum maturity to 40 years. The minimum downpayment under the law is 3 percent. The other subsection is 221(d)(4) which provides for the insurance of mortgages on rental housing for low- and moderate-income groups.

In the 7 years prior to 1961, FHA insured 25,000 home mortgages under section 221(d)(2). Since the effective date of the 1961 Housing Act, it has insured an additional 36,000 units, making a total of nearly 61,000 homes. Under section 221(d)(4) a total of 62 projects covering 7,500 rental units have been insured, including 12 projects with 924 units insured since the 1961 act became law. These figures include units provided for displaced families as well as for low- and moderate-income families generally.

While the volume of activity has been relatively small, this program has great potential and fills an important need in our efforts to encourage private financing for housing in the low price and rent ranges. House Joint Resolution 467 would continue the program in its present form until June 30, 1965. I urge the passage of the resolution today so that the Senate can act and it can reach the President's desk for signature prior to the June 30 expiration date.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to affirm what the distinguished chairman has said. This resolution was reported unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full committee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The change that would be made would bring into line two sections, 221(d)(2) and 221(d)(4) to section 221(d)(3), which presently has an expiration date 2 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of the resolution.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 467 to extend sections 221(d)(2) and 221(d)(4) of the National Housing Act for 2 more years.

Section 221 was made a part of the National Housing Act in 1954 to assist the housing industry to provide relocation housing for families displaced by urban renewal or governmental action. Although the act did not so specify, the intention was to help families of limited income, since most displaced families are in this category and those with higher incomes have no trouble relocating themselves.

Section 221(d)(2) authorized FHA mortgage insurance for home properties, and section 221(d)(3) mortgage insurance on multifamily rental housing sponsored by nonprofit organizations or public bodies. Section 221(d)(4), permitting mortgage insurance on rental housing with profit-motivated sponsorship, was added in 1959.

The Housing Act of 1961 made some sweeping revisions in section 221 in recognition of its suitability as a vehicle to provide housing for moderate income families in general as well as displaced families. The 1961 act removed the previous limitation, on mortgage insurance under the section, to relocation housing, and also removed the requirement for certification by the HHFA Administrator of need for the housing.

These new provisions of the section were intended for families with incomes too high for public housing but not high enough to enable them to compete for adequate housing in the private market. So that Congress might have an opportunity to assess the value of the new provisions in practical application, termination dates were provided except for relocation housing. The cutoff dates are July 1, 1962, for section 221(d)(2)—homes—and 221(d)(4)—multifamily rental and cooperative housing with profit-motivated sponsorship—and July 1, 1965, for section 221(d)(3)—multifamily housing with nonprofit sponsorship.

I feel very strongly that the (d)(2) and (d)(4) programs are needed and that the 2-year period in which they have operated in their present form has not been adequate to demonstrate their value. In the middle and higher income market, housing supply and demand have reached a state of balance in which there is no longer an acute shortage; but special financing terms are still needed to bring homeownership within the reach of families with lower incomes and to make good rental and cooperative housing available to other families for whom homeownership is not at present feasible.

In my own part of the country we are constantly made aware of the necessity for programs that will provide decent housing at the lowest possible cost. I recently had the pleasure of having FHA Commissioner Brownstein visit my district and review the housing problems of the area, and (d)(4) in particular was suggested as one of the possible answers to providing good rental housing for moderate-income families. We could probably make good use of (d)(2) also.

Figures on a national basis indicate how the industry has accepted the 1961 provisions of the latter section. In the first half of 1961, the FHA received 3,674 applications under the old provisions.

In the second half of the year, following passage of the 1961 Housing Act, more than 11,000 applications were received. Altogether, from the passage of the 1961 act through May 1963 there were 69,200 (d) (2) applications, compared with 39,300 for the nearly 7 preceding years during which it was in effect. From August 1954 through June 1961, 25,400 mortgages totaling \$232.9 million were insured, and from July 1961 through May 1963, 38,000 mortgages totaling \$395 million have been insured.

Although section 211(d) (4) has been slower in starting under the 1961 provisions, builders are gradually becoming aware of its advantages in providing low-cost multifamily housing. No mortgages were insured under this section before the 1961 Housing Act became law. Since July 1961, the FHA has insured mortgages totaling \$8.9 million on 14 (d) (4) projects with 1,117 units. Thirteen applications on projects with 1,477 units are in process at the present time.

One advantage of (d) (4) financing is that the mortgage represents a percentage of estimated replacement cost rather than of appraised value as under the regular section 207 rental housing program of FHA. Generally speaking, basing the mortgage on replacement cost rather than on appraised value permits a higher mortgage amount. If there are disadvantages of location, for example, appraised value will fall below replacement cost and the mortgage amount will be correspondingly restricted. Housing financing under (d) (4) does not have to meet the location requirements of section 207. It must be located in a marketable area but not necessarily in an exceptionally desirable area. A workable program for the community is not a requirement, nor is a finding of economic soundness required; however, cost certification provisions apply. The housing can be built in an urban renewal area or elsewhere. The provisions of the section are especially suitable for financing rehabilitation of multifamily properties.

This section fills a gap between urban renewal housing and the higher rent housing built under section 207. The mortgage limits are less than under section 207 or 220, but are higher than those established for nonprofit or limited-dividend sponsorship under 221(d) (3).

Because of the special incentives section 221(d) (4) offers and because of the growing interest in it, I recommend that it be continued for another 2 years as provided in House Joint Resolution 467.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, an issue is presently before the House that demands the support of every Representative from every district in the Nation. House Joint Resolution 467, a bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Housing Administration 221 housing program until 1965, is absolutely necessary if we are to continue to provide housing for our low and middle income citizens.

For many years the "package of tools" offered by Congress through the Federal Housing Administration has been among the most popular programs offered by the Federal Government. FHA has established itself as an efficient administrative agency and has good relations with both

the public and the business community. Its programs have helped homeownership in the United States to reach an unprecedented level of 62.5 percent in 1961.

All FHA programs have been designed, in one way or another, to encourage homeownership by citizens who would otherwise be forced to remain renters all their lives. Section 221(d) (2) and section 221(d) (4) are exceptionally good examples.

Section 221 became a part of the Nation Housing Act in 1954 when Congress became concerned with the relocation of families from urban renewal projects. These families were largely renters and, for the most part, low on the income ladder. Their chances of homeownership were dim and the prospect of having to move to another slum area was ever present. Section 221 offered a chance for many of those unfortunate people to leave their old environment and reside in a suitable neighborhood either as renters or homeowners.

In 1961 sweeping revisions were made in the 221 program when it was recognized that it could be employed to meet the growing, and unmet, need for low and middle income housing other than relocation housing. Section 221(d) (2) differs from other FHA programs in that it requires a lower downpayment, in some cases has a longer mortgage term, and enjoys less restrictive minimum standards. Section 221(d) (4) offers encouragement to the construction of low and middle income apartments for those who need time to save for future homeownership.

Since enactment of these revisions in the 221 program in 1961 things have moved at a brisk pace. Under the (d) (2) program 36,000 units have been insured and 62 projects covering 7,500 rental units have been insured under the (d) (4) program.

It pleases me to lend my support to such a worthy program. The growing need for adequate housing in this country is a recognized fact. This is especially true in the area of low and middle income housing. These two FHA programs, the extension of which was reported favorably by both the House Subcommittee on Housing and the House Committee on Banking and Currency, deserve to be extended for another 2 years. House Joint Resolution 467 will legalize the continued benefits of these two vital FHA programs. This measure has received my enthusiastic support and I will continue to be a friend of such needed legislation. I trust that my fellow Congressmen will rally to the need in sufficient numbers so that this measure can pass without further hesitation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 467.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the housing resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 4(b) and 6(c) of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850 and 851; 5 U.S.C. 3053(b) and 3055(c)) are hereby repealed.

Sec. 2. Section 8(a) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "In addition, the Government shall contribute annually and there shall be deposited in the Fund amounts for payment of expenses incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

Sec. 3. Section 8(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for all payments on account of the health benefits plan negotiated under section 3 of this Act, for payment of the Government's contribution provided for by section 6(a) of this Act to agencies of the Government which administer a retirement system for civilian employees of the Government, and for payment of expenses, within such limitations as may be specified annually in appropriation Acts, incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 3517, will probably not affect the destiny of the Nation, but it is an important bill to 415,000 retired Federal employees. Since objection was made when this bill was placed on the Consent Calendar, I think perhaps it is important that we take 3 or 4 minutes to explain what the bill is and what it would do.

This bill is based on a recommendation by the Civil Service Commission. A similar proposal was passed out of the committee in the 87th Congress. It was not acted upon by the House because we ran

out of time in the closing days of the session.

For several years we have had a health benefits program for active Federal employees, including those in the legislative and executive branches. These employees customarily have deducted from their pay an amount which is matched by the Government, and they receive certain health and medical benefits. At the time this legislation was enacted there was no provision for those who had already retired. Today there are some 415,000 former Federal employees.

Congress passed an act in September 1960 which gave medical and health benefits to employees who had retired after July of 1960. These people received a Federal annuity and from their pay is taken each month \$3 if they are single, or \$6 for a family. This is matched by contributions from the U.S. Treasury, and for this they receive these benefits.

In this little bill we are talking only about the 415,000 retired Federal employees. We are not talking about those who hereafter retire. They are covered under their present plan and will continue to have coverage.

The purpose of this bill and all it would accomplish is this: It would remove from the existing law a provision which limits the portion of the Government's contribution which the Civil Service Commission may use for administrative expenses for this act. This amount is now limited to 2 percent. This 2-percent limit would be eliminated by this bill. I should say that this legislation was reported unanimously from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I know of no Member of the House who is here today to object to it.

The 2-percent limitation formula was first applied during the fiscal year 1963. Our committee report indicates that the amount available on the basis of 2 percent of the Government's contribution for fiscal 1963 would be \$282,000. This was based on 2 percent of the estimated Federal contribution of \$14,118,000. However, the actual amount appropriated for Government contributions during fiscal 1963 was only \$12,807,000, rather than the \$14 million requested. This resulted in an amount being available for the administration of this important act of only \$256,000. This \$256,000 was not sufficient for proper administration. The actual costs in the last 3 or 4 years have been as follows: In 1961, \$412,000; in 1962, \$474,000; in fiscal 1963, estimated, \$393,000. Thus it has become readily apparent in the administration of this act that the 2-percent formula does not give enough room and does not provide the necessary funds.

Thus, the Civil Service Commission has a serious budgetary problem in trying to carry out the responsibilities we have given them. A way was found out of it, a temporary way, during the current fiscal year. The Independent Offices Appropriation Act actually authorized \$375,000 and appropriated that amount rather than the \$256,000 which would have been available under the 2-percent limitation. The budget proposal for

fiscal year 1964 calls for \$392,000. Thus we have provided temporary relief in the appropriation acts while the legislative provisions governing the administration of this Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefit Act has a 2-percent limitation.

The question might be asked, Why have the costs of administration exceeded the 2-percent formula that the Congress thought would be adequate when the act was passed? Basically there are three reasons.

The first is that participation by the annuitants has been substantially less than was expected. The House and the Congress thought that perhaps 95 percent of the retired Federal employees would take advantage of this fine program. Actually about 60 percent have applied and are participating. Lower participation, of course, means a correspondingly smaller Government contribution and a correspondingly smaller amount available for administrative purposes.

Secondly, dealing with these older retired people, many of whom are unfamiliar with this law, are unfamiliar with the benefits, has proven to be more costly than was expected; especially in dealing with thousands of elderly people on a subject that is new to them, and that is somewhat complex, has required a great deal of correspondence and additional staff that was not anticipated. It is really difficult for the Civil Service Commission to communicate as effectively with these people as with active Federal employees. This was not fully anticipated.

The third reason is that the program involves a closed group which can only decrease with the passage of time. This group will never grow. It covers just those who retired prior to September 1960, and as deaths occur this group will gradually be reduced until the whole program is closed out. Yet the natural decrease in the size of the group will mean a gradual reduction in both the Government contribution and the administrative costs. But the characteristic of this group, they being elderly people, is such that it will decrease at a more rapid rate than the administrative cost. Thus the committee has come to the conclusion that there is no real possibility of the administrative costs being retained within the 2-percent limitation. We had a patchwork kind of correction for this situation last year, but the only permanent relief is to pass this bill.

You might ask what will happen if we defeat this bill and the law is not changed? I should anticipate some kind of temporary relief would be asked for from the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations. They have been very cooperative. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has helped to work out a plan for this difficult period. But this is a program that has been authorized by the Congress and we should not put the Civil Service Commission or the Appropriations Committee in a position of having to adjust a patchwork formula to make sure that these 415,000 people receive the benefits that Congress has authorized.

I think it would be shortsighted economy to defeat this bill. It would only cost \$100,000 for this year and it is anticipated that the extra cost above the 2-percent limitation would not go much beyond that in the years to come.

I would emphasize again that the bill has bipartisan support, that it came out of a subcommittee of which the ranking minority member was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]. It was approved in the full committee. I know of no one who is opposed to it today.

Mr. Speaker, I should hope that this bill will receive the prompt and favorable attention of the House today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], this legislation was approved by our committee unanimously. It certainly is not controversial. This bill, H.R. 3517, was on the Consent Calendar for several weeks but an objection to it made it necessary to call it up under suspension of the rules.

Actually, the only thing that the bill does, in the final analysis, is to eliminate an awkward administrative procedure. It will permit the Committee on Appropriations to exercise some discretion in appropriating necessary funds to administer the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. Back in 1960, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service made, I believe, a major contribution by encouraging business and private industry generally to do something to help solve the problem of medical and hospital care for our elderly citizens. In 1960 we provided that all retired Federal employees could come under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act which was similar to a measure Congress approved for active Federal employees in 1959. When we enacted this law in 1959, we provided that Federal employees who retired in the future could continue their medical and hospitalization benefits. But we did not provide for those who had retired in previous years. So we came back in 1960, as I said, and enacted a new law that did provide for all retired Federal employees to have medical and hospitalization protection. We hope, or at least this Member hopes, that this will encourage all business and industry to provide a similar type of program for all of their retired employees so that no blanket Federal aid for medical care would be necessary to take care of our senior citizens.

When we enacted this program in 1960, we estimated that the administrative expenses would be approximately 2 percent of the Government's contribution. That was a reasonable estimate and an accurate estimate provided as large a number of retired employees participated in the program as we estimated. As was pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona, there were 415,000 retired Federal employees who would be eligible to participate in this program. On the basis of a 90 percent participation by retired Federal employees in the program, the

Federal annual contribution was estimated to be approximately \$21 million. Certainly, 2 percent of that contribution would amount to approximately \$420,000 annually which was the cost of administering the program as estimated by the Civil Service Commission and by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. However, we were mistaken in our estimate because we found that only approximately 60 percent of those retired employees exercised the option of participating in the program. So the purpose of this legislation is to remove this 2 percent administrative limitation from the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and to permit the Committee on Appropriations, as I said earlier in my remarks, some latitude and discretion in appropriating funds for this purpose. At the present time, it is necessary to include a corrective provision in the appropriation bill each time. It is really an awkward situation. In a sense we are invalidating an act of Congress in doing what we are doing now. In this legislation we are asking the Congress to amend this particular provision of the original act so that we can have a much more orderly administrative procedure. This is not going to cost a nickel more in the final analysis. In fact, the actual cost of administering the program is going to diminish over a period of years because this act only applies to those who retired in former years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will overwhelmingly approve this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out that the two gentlemen who have spoken in support of this bill have properly explained it. This is nothing but a matter of bringing administrative procedures into harmony with the actual facts of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman in urging that this bill be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arizona that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3517.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

RETIREMENT INEQUITY—ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251(c)), is amended by inserting "the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol," immediately following "official duties,"

(b) Section 2(c) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 22(d)), is amended by inserting "(other than the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol)" immediately following "congressional employee."

(c) Section 2(d) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252(d)), is amended by inserting "except as provided under subsection (f)," immediately following "temporary congressional employee."

(d) Section 5(d) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2255(d)), is amended by striking out "to the Architect of the Capitol or any employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol."

SEC. 2. The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall not apply in the case of employees retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act. The rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such amendments had not been enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5377 was reported unanimously by your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and should be enacted to correct an inequity in the law which adversely affects the civil service retirement rights of employees of the Architect of the Capitol.

The employees covered by the bill are in every sense congressional employees. The Architect of the Capitol has been defined by the Comptroller General of the United States, in several decisions, to be an officer of the Congress, and the Office of the Architect of the Capitol likewise has been defined to be a part of the legislative establishment. All of the duties and responsibilities of the Architect and of employees of his Office are devoted to the service of the Congress.

The Congress in 1954, recognizing the unique conditions of congressional employment, enacted legislation to provide a carefully planned and practical retirement program for congressional employees. The same unique conditions apply to employment in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. Like other congressional employees, neither the Architect has nor do his employees have civil service or other protective status. Yet neither the Architect was nor his employees were included in the congressional employees' retirement program enacted in 1954.

As a result, although they are truly congressional employees and direct all of their working time and energy to serving the Congress, their retirement benefits are considerably inferior to those of their fellow congressional employees. The omission of these congressional employees from the congressional employees' retirement program apparently was due to an oversight. There is no record of any consideration being given to them when the 1954 legislation was being developed and approved. Possibly a contributing circumstance to their omission from the program is the fact that their salaries are the same as those under the Classification Act of 1949, an act which applies generally to executive branch employees. However, that is merely a matter of administrative convenience and in no way alters the status of the Architect and his employees as congressional employees.

This legislation extends no civil service retirement rights to anyone not already entitled to retirement rights. It simply alters such rights for the employees covered to make them equal to rights now available to other congressional employees. The bill can affect no more than 1,175 individuals. In fact, since the retirement act already provides for the Architect to exclude employees whose tenure is temporary or of uncertain duration, and also requires a minimum of 5 years of congressional service to qualify for any benefits under the congressional employees' program, it is very probable that the number of individuals covered will be substantially less than 1,175. Over two-thirds of the 1,175 employees are specifically subject by statute to congressional committee or congressional commission control under present law.

Mr. Speaker, this is very worthy legislation and I hope it will receive the prompt approval of the House.

Positions under the Architect of the Capitol

Appropriations	Wage board positions	Unclassified positions	Classification Act positions	Statutory positions	Total positions
Salaries, Architect of the Capitol	1	3	26	3	33
Capitol Buildings and Grounds	96	44	16		156
Capitol Grounds	49		6		55
Senate office buildings	286	54	21	8	369
Legislative garage	7				7
House office buildings	284	76	21		381
Capitol Power Plant	78		4		82
Library buildings and grounds	57		2		59
Subtotal	858	177	96	11	1,142
Care of the building and grounds, Supreme Court	31		2		33
Total	889	177	98	11	1,175

Hearings of 1964—Breakdown of regular force under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol engaged in structural and mechanical care of the Capitol Building and Grounds, Senate and House Office buildings, Capitol Power Plant, Library of Congress buildings, U.S. Supreme Court building, and legislative garage

Capitol Power Plant: Engineers, mechanics, helpers, and laborers.....	82
Electrical substations and transformer stations (located in Capitol, Senate Office buildings, House Office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and U.S. Supreme Court building): Operators, mechanics, helpers.....	12
Air conditioning—operation and maintenance: Engineers and mechanics.....	62
Structural care of buildings and operation of miscellaneous equipment: Maintenance mechanics and helpers (plumbers, electricians, carpenters, painters, sheet-metal workers, heating room attendants, public address system operators, subway operators).....	170
Elevators—maintenance and repair: Mechanics and helpers.....	29
Elevators—Operation: Elevator operators.....	143
General domestic care of buildings: Laborers, full-time.....	201
Charwomen, part-time.....	300
Capitol Grounds—Care and Maintenance: Gardeners and laborers.....	49
Legislative garage—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers.....	7
House garage (old building)—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers.....	10
Professional, administrative, and office force: Architect, engineers, administrative and clerical assistants, and miscellaneous.....	110

March 1963, total employees..... 1,175

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], in support of this legislation, H.R. 5377. As he pointed out, this was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee.

In substance the bill brings all of the employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol under the same retirement system that all other employees of the legislative branch of the Government now enjoy. In fact, two-thirds of the employees of the Architect of the Capitol already are subject to congressional committee or congressional commission control under present law and, therefore, they should be treated the same as all other legislative employees.

There are approximately 1,175 employees who would be brought under the congressional employees retirement system as a result of this act. The Comptroller General has ruled that the Architect of the Capitol and all of its employees are employees of the legislative branch of the Government. They have no connection whatsoever with civil service insofar as civil service status and job security protection is concerned. I believe the reason the employees of the Architect of the Capitol were not included in the present act when it was approved by the Congress in 1954 was the result of an oversight. No one suggested that they be included, and no one had

any opportunity to object to their being included.

Interestingly enough, some employees of the Architect of the Capitol are already under this legislative retirement system.

As a result of the ruling of the Comptroller General, employees of the restaurants of the House and Senate are already included. Perhaps the reason why all employees of the Architect of the Capitol have not been included is the result of confusion, since they are paid under civil service Classification Act salary scales.

There is a chart on page 5 of the report which shows the difference between the present retirement benefits of employees of the Architect of the Capitol, which is the same as those in the regular civil service and the proposed benefits which are identical to the retirement benefits now enjoyed by other legislative employees.

We are preventing any windfall under this act. Those working part-time or more or less temporarily will not receive the benefits proposed by this legislation because we require that they be employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol for 5 years before they can come under the provisions of the bill.

This legislation merely seeks to eliminate an inequity where one group of employees was treated one way and another group another way. The cost is estimated to be approximately \$315,000, which is a moderate cost to take care of this inequity, the very serious inequity that has existed over the years. This legislation would correct the inequity and I hope my colleagues will join in overwhelmingly supporting the passage of this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee appointed to consider this legislation, I join with my colleagues in support of it. It has been thoroughly explained, and, therefore, further explanation is unnecessary.

The full committee agreed that this bill would correct an inequity.

I hope the House will pass it overwhelmingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5377.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5932) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District

of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3002(a)) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That no teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

Sec. 2. Section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091(a)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and in no event shall any teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

Sec. 3. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins not later than the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5932 is the result of an official administration request that was submitted to the Congress by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I was privileged to serve on the subcommittee which held hearings on the measure at which favorable testimony was received from the government of the District of Columbia and from representatives of the District of Columbia Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. There was no adverse testimony received from any source and the bill was reported by a unanimous vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

This legislation will correct a very inequitable situation that now exists with regard to schoolteachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia who are serving under so-called temporary appointments. Enactment of this legislation will permit these temporary teachers, if their service aggregates 2 or more school years, to elect coverage under the Federal employees

health benefits program and the Federal employees group life insurance program. They are now excluded from both of these programs by reason of their so-called temporary status.

Of the nearly 5,000 full-time schoolteachers employed in the District of Columbia public school system, approximately 1,700 have temporary status. These temporary teachers are employed on a yearly basis—their appointments by law cannot extend beyond June 30 of the fiscal year in which appointed—and the appointments are renewable each year and they may also be terminated at any time with or without reason. Generally these teachers are serving in a so-called temporary status either because they may fail to meet one or more of the detailed technical requirements and, therefore, have not taken the necessary qualifying examinations, or because they do not expect to remain long in service and so do not wish to attain permanent status. In addition, there are a number of teachers who must be employed on a temporary basis to fill temporary positions and to replace permanent teachers whose job rights must be protected while they are on leaves of absence.

I would like to emphasize that all temporary teachers must meet certain minimum qualifications such as possessing a bachelor's degree from a recognized college or university; being a citizen of the United States; and being of good moral character. However, some of these teachers may lack a technical requirement for appointment on a permanent basis such as not possessing credit in college work closely related to the subject field in which they teach, not possessing the master's degree that is required for teaching in senior high school, or not meeting the age requirements. For example, many fine teachers are employed in a temporary status because they are above the 50-year age limit for appointment on a permanent basis. These, generally, are the teachers who have returned to the profession in later years, after having raised families.

The temporary schoolteacher is most definitely an important part of the District of Columbia school system. Of the approximately 1,700 temporary teachers now employed, 700 have served for 2 or more years, 270 have more than 5 years of service, and some have taught for 15 and 20 years. Under the provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefits and Group Life Insurance Acts and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission issued pursuant thereto, employees serving under appointments limited to 1 year or less are excluded from participating in these two programs. Temporary schoolteachers of the District of Columbia, therefore, because of the nature of their yearly appointments and even though many have served and dedicated a number of years of their lives to the public school system are precluded from enjoying these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 5932 will correct this most inequitable situation. It amends both the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide that no

teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia serving under a temporary appointment shall be excluded if such teacher has been so employed for a period or periods totaling not less than 2 school years.

The cost of this legislation is very nominal. It is estimated that the additional cost of the District of Columbia Government would be approximately \$39,000 a year which would be absorbed from regular appropriations in the normal course of operations.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of fairness and equity, I urge the adoption of this most worthwhile legislation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, again I am happy to state that I am supporting legislation which was approved unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It certainly indicates we have a very harmonious committee. Unfortunately we do have some legislation which is considered by that committee that is not quite as noncontroversial as the legislation we have here under a suspension of the rules today.

This bill, H.R. 5932, Mr. Speaker, provides an amendment to the Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide health and life insurance benefits for certain teachers in Washington, D.C. At the time the Congress approved and passed those acts we provided that the benefits would extend only to those Federal employees who had appointments of a year or more. We found that this excluded approximately one-third of the schoolteachers of the District of Columbia from the benefits of either the life insurance or health insurance acts. There are 1,700 of these 5,000 schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who fall into the classification of temporary appointees. They can only be appointed on a school year to school year basis. I think they are appointed for the term to start in September and end in June of each year and, because of certain technical reasons they cannot obtain a permanent appointment. Those technical reasons fall into many categories. In the first place, they have to have a master's degree to teach in senior high schools. They may lack certain college credits along the lines of the subject that they are teaching. They might be over 50 years of age. They might not be able to pass an examination, but yet they are good, sound, qualified teachers and have been teaching in the school system for a number of years. As pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey, over 700 of these teachers have been teaching in the District of Columbia school system for more than 2 years.

They must have a bachelor's degree in order to teach. They must be of good moral character. They must be citizens of the United States. So these are good teachers. But because of certain technical reasons they are not able to receive an appointment on a permanent basis and must be appointed on a year-to-year basis.

All this legislation does is to amend the acts of 1954 and 1959 to permit teachers in the District of Columbia School System whose service aggregates

more than 2 school years to qualify for health benefits and life insurance benefits.

The cost is very nominal. It is estimated to cost approximately \$38,000 a year. It has the support of all segments of the District of Columbia Government. Again, as pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey, there was no opposition whatsoever to the legislation when we conducted hearings on the bill a few weeks ago. This will not affect the part-time employees, the so-called substitute teachers. We will still carry out the act as originally intended, that persons must be on a somewhat permanent basis before they can qualify for the health and life insurance benefits.

I hope the Members will approve this legislation overwhelmingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5932?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to apologize to those Members who feel that they have been unduly inconvenienced by my actions of the past few days, in objecting to certain unanimous-consent requests in connection with extensions of their remarks in the body and Appendix of the daily RECORD where such extensions involved the inclusion of extraneous material.

I want to reemphasize at this point, however, that nothing that I have done has had the effect of limiting any Member in the extension of his own remarks in any manner whatsoever, and there has been neither any intention nor the effect of limiting debate or limiting the space in the RECORD which might be utilized for the expression of the personal opinions of any Member. Particularly would I emphasize the fact that this action in objecting to the extension of remarks in the Appendix to include extraneous material, in more than one instance on any single legislative day, and in objecting to the inclusion of extraneous material in the body of the RECORD, was not motivated by any vindictiveness on my part. Inasmuch as no other person was responsible, either directly or indirectly, for my action, I want it understood that I, and I alone, accept any and all responsibility for any inconvenience that was occasioned by this action.

I hope that I have pointed up not only what I consider to be an abuse of a privilege that is available to all Members, only through unanimous consent, but that I have called attention to an extravagant practice that is costing the taxpayers of this Nation hundreds of

thousands of dollars each year, and have also pointed out how a lax interpretation and enforcement of the rules of the House can result in an unnecessarily large expenditure of funds. In the extension of these remarks I will point out how I believe the laws and rules for publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not being enforced. Because reprints of these laws and rules are readily available from the Joint Committee on Printing, I will not ask for permission to have them printed at this point in the RECORD, though from time to time excerpts from them are printed as filler material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at this time that it is not my intention to continue with this solo crusade to bring some semblance of reasonableness in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which, as I understand it, is supposed to be as far as practicable a verbatim account of the proceedings in the two Chambers of the Congress. I recognize that the rules of the House supersede the course of conduct in the allowances now taken to depart from this original design, and for that reason I believe that there should be rules in the form of guidelines to assist Members in conforming to a reasonable practice. At this time we do not have such rules, and while in the past Speakers of the House have enunciated certain practices which would be observed and which have been observed in the absence of unwritten rules, it has been some time since this House has had the benefit of such guidelines.

It will be recalled that at the outset of this short campaign I issued a call for volunteers to assist me. I have received encouragement from many Members who have stated privately, and I might add rather quietly, that they consider that I have been performing a meritorious service; many say they believe there should be limitations, and I have found no one who is willing to defend the practice of permitting unrestricted use of either the body or the Appendix of the daily RECORD for the inclusion of extraneous material, when such use by any one Member exceeds more than \$25,000 for any one session, more than the salary of any Member. But, I must admit that my call for volunteers who were willing to stick their neck out, fell on deaf ears. In this instance, at least, no one seems willing to give even lip-service to economy. While I am not promising to completely abandon my efforts to bring about some semblance of reasonableness, which would result in the savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars, let us say for the time being, I have accepted a self-imposed suspend fire, which I reserve the right to reimpose if and when the abuses appear to reach the proportions that have been indicated in the past. I will continue to endeavor to seek relief through committees of this House, the Joint Committee on Printing, and continue to seek the cooperation of the Speaker and individual Members of this body.

By studying the changes that have occurred in practices in connection with the granting of unanimous consent requests for extensions both in the body and in

the Appendix of the daily RECORD, there has developed a tendency to approve unanimous consent requests, the exact nature of which are not revealed to other Members of the House, or even to the Speaker. The use of the word "extraneous" material can cover a wide variety of material. For instance, the practice has grown up whereas it has become an accepted procedure for a Member to ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks to include extraneous material, and when there is no objection and the request is approved, the Member then yields back the balance of his time without making any statement on the floor, and without indicating either the subject that he proposes to discuss in his 1 minute speech, or the nature of the extraneous material that is to be offered. On the following day other Members read in the RECORD a long dissertation, often on a controversial subject, accompanied by newspaper articles, editorials, or sometimes even speeches by controversial figures who are not Members of Congress, yet whose remarks have been given the same status as if they were uttered by responsible Members of this body. I say that this is contrary to the spirit and letter of the law. It would seem to me that when a Member requests permission to address the House he should at least indicate the subject on which he proposes to speak even if he elects to remain silent. Also, I would think that other Members are entitled to know the nature of the extraneous material that he seeks to include. Some years ago when a Member made such a request, he indicated that he desired to include an article from a specific publication dealing with a specific subject; or that he wished to include a resolution from a specified organization, supporting or opposing a specific issue that was being considered in the Congress. Many Members with whom I have talked think it might be well to reestablish these customs of the past. Certainly, there should be a little argument against requiring that a Member be on the floor and make his own requests, rather than have them all lumped in one wholesale package at the end of the day, when no one has any idea about what subject any Member wishes to extend his remarks. It is possible that some other Member might want to respond at the time an original statement is made rather than to wait over a weekend.

I would like to quote from the law which gives the Joint Committee on Printing control over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Title 44, section 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; arrangement, style, content, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, sec. 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

As stated earlier, I will not burden the RECORD with printing the rules of

the Joint Committee on Printing, but would recommend to all Members a reading of the same. I would point out, however, one rule that appears to have been violated on many occasions:

10(a). Appendix to Daily RECORD.—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Providing*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We all are familiar, I believe, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that there are certain space limitations, in connection with rule 11, which states that:

No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, etc.

During the time I have been a Member of this House, I cannot recall a single instance when objection was made to such a request, notwithstanding the cost, which quite frankly, in many instances, has exceeded what I would interpret as a reasonable request.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a limitation on the use of the RECORD for the extension of extraneous material, which while it might appear to be more generous than some Members might feel would be justifiable under the terms of a rule or reasonableness, nevertheless, would in my opinion, result in great savings to the taxpayers. I would propose that each individual Member be limited to an average of not more than 2 pages of extraneous material during each week that Congress is in session, but not require that this limitation be imposed on a weekly basis, but over the entire session. Figuring a session of 42 weeks, this would amount to a total of 84 pages that could be used during the session, which would limit the cost to be incurred by any one Member to not more than \$7,560. I doubt if more than 10 percent of the Members would use this entire amount, for the RECORD indicates that the large percentage of the Members use this privilege only on rare occasions, and use some discretion and selectivity in requesting the publication of extraneous material. I believe such a rule would not impose an undue or unreasonable hardship or inconvenience on many Members, and would certainly result in the savings of a great amount of money, not to mention the fact that it would serve to make the RECORD more nearly an accurate recording of the proceedings.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I express the hope that the Members will realize that I have attempted to be objective in my thinking, rather than merely acting in the role of an objector, who seeks to impose his personal views, under the rules of the House which do permit the action which I have taken. I

have not relished this role. It has not been easy. Again may I say there has been no spirit of vindictiveness on my part. I have attempted to be both fair and consistent. I am constrained to believe that a majority are sympathetic to the purpose I have been attempting to attain, although I realize there are many who resent the manner in which I have proceeded. I have pointed out the problem; I have suggested one of many solutions; I am ready to abide by the decision of the majority.

TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILLITY

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity."

Among the declared objectives of the Constitution of the United States these two stand together in its preamble—in this sequence.

In the current racial controversy in our country these two goals now appear to be arrayed against each other in open conflict.

It is made to seem that we cannot have either one without the sacrifice of the other.

Insofar as they are so arrayed in opposition it is an unnatural conflict.

Justice and tranquillity belong together. Each urgently needs the other. There can be no true or lasting domestic tranquillity without justice.

And tranquillity is the climate required for justice to flourish.

How, then, has this tragic conflict and dilemma come to pass?

Perhaps because the denials of justice to some of our Negro citizens are greater and graver than some of his white fellow citizens have recognized or been willing to acknowledge.

Perhaps because some white citizens have mistaken domestic tranquillity for preservation of an unjust status quo or a comfortable escape from vexatious problems—meanwhile forgetting that tranquillity cannot be maintained indefinitely if injustice is indefinitely tolerated.

Perhaps, also, because some of our Negro fellow citizens have, in rash impatience or in their own intolerance, discounted gains already made, ignored opportunities for added gains, and sought to impose still other gains which can only be earned and cannot be enforced.

Perhaps because some of our citizens, both Negro and white, forget that protracted disruption or domestic tranquillity—even in a supposed quest for justice—does not and cannot provide a solid and permanent foundation for justice. And that such disruption instead ultimately insures only complete chaos for everyone.

Perhaps it is all of these things—and more.

In the pursuit of explanations, and of answers and solutions, let us consult each other—and our own consciences—on these matters.

But let us not make these explanations, however valid or warranted, the basis for mutual recriminations. "Let us judge not, that we be not judged."

And how is the conflict to be resolved and the rightful partnership of justice and domestic tranquillity restored in our land?

By more laws, more apparatus and power of government?

Perhaps—though all of us can be losers to an all-powerful government.

More likely, I suspect, it can be accomplished by more vigorous and effective leadership, Negro and white, in and out of government, nationally and locally—and within both races.

Are we to rely for decision of the issue on more "in the streets" mass demonstrations, more boycotts, or additional pressure tactics and coercive measures?

I very much doubt it even though I see little prospect of early acceptance of what to me seems the wiser counsel against these methods. The fever is upon us.

But when this troubled and turbulent phase does finally pass—as it surely will after needless casualties to justice and domestic tranquillity alike—I firmly believe that it will be mutually tolerant and generous negotiations and meaningful communication that bring us to our true goal.

And that goal is cordial, sensible, voluntary acceptance of each other in mutual good will, with an understanding that justice is for all—and that responsibility is for all as well.

And then justice and domestic tranquillity will once again stand together in genuine partnership—not only in our Constitution's preamble but in the life and affairs of our beloved country.

BILL NUNLEY NAMED DRIVER OF THE YEAR

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding individual who has recently been selected as the American Trucking Association's "National Driver of the Year."

I am speaking of William C. Nunley whose outstanding record of driving safety, courtesy, and heroism and community and company service has overwhelmingly earned him the title of "Driver of the Year."

This Thursday, the Oklahoma congressional delegation will have a breakfast to honor Mr. Nunley and Mr. Fisher Muldrow, the executive vice president of

the Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma—the organization which nominated Bill Nunley for the national award. We are looking forward to meeting this outstanding person.

But Nunley's career as a truckdriver stretches over the past 30 years. In that time, he has driven more than 2,225,000 miles without a single accident.

For the past 26 years, he has been an employee of the Yellow Transit Lines out of that firm's Oklahoma City, Okla., office. During this period of more than a quarter of a century, Bill Nunley has hauled an estimated 328 million pounds of valuable freight without incurring as much as a scratched fender.

His outstanding record has been rewarded with many honors. In 1962, he was named the "Driver of the Year" by the Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma and on two previous occasions he was selected as the "State Driver of the Month."

His record of driving safety speaks for itself. In addition, Mr. Nunley has been cited for his efforts in assisting many motorists in trouble.

For example, when a crippling ice storm had highway traffic tied up all over the State, Mr. Nunley encountered an Army officer whose car had broken down near Adair, Okla., while he was taking his seriously ill wife to a hospital. Realizing the hazards an ambulance would face on the icy roads and the importance of time, Bill Nunley assumed the risk himself and towed the couple in their vehicle to Pryor, Okla., where the woman was able to receive medical attention.

Bill Nunley has also taken an active part in company safety activities. His work in the research and development of safety devices was instrumental in the installation of safety belts in Yellow Transit's extensive truck fleet. Mr. Nunley has also been a driver-trainer for the past 10 years and his students have amassed a cumulative safety record running into hundreds of thousands of miles.

Mr. Nunley also actively participates in community affairs. In addition to his busy schedule on the job, he finds time to work with young people as a youth baseball and basketball coach. He has also made frequent radio and television appearances for safety causes in the Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas region.

This native of Tennessee, resident of Kansas, and truckdriver in Oklahoma and Texas is indeed a credit and an outstanding example of the men and women in the trucking industry. My sincere congratulations go to Bill Nunley on his most recent honor of being named "Driver of the Year."

THE PLIGHT OF THE BALTIMORE STATES

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last weekend marked the 22d anniversary of the first mass deportations from the Baltic States which took place on June 14, 15, and 16, 1941.

Generation after generation of the Baltic people have withstood the influence of their adversaries even though they were physically overcome. The people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have never lost their identity and have preserved their cultural heritage and their individuality throughout centuries of vicissitudes despite superimposed regimes.

It is ironic that the latest effort to overcome the Baltic people and to destroy their nationality and their long-preserved identity should have come from Russia within the generation of those who in establishing the Soviet Government proclaimed "the right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination up to and including separation and formation of independent states."—International Conciliation, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 1963, page 11n.

How long will the Soviet Union continue this denial of a cardinal principle upon which it was founded? How long will the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia remain in bondage or in exile? The suffering of those who were deported cannot be expunged. But the principles for which they stood, the heritage which they preserved will live on as reminders that for people who truly believe in independence of spirit there can be no denial of the right of self-determination. The spirit of liberty is alive in the hearts of the Baltic peoples and will not be extinguished by totalitarian oppression.

THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which is designed to improve the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration by clarifying much of the present ambiguous language of the act, insuring uniformity of implementation among the various Federal agencies concerned, and establishing an independent administrative review procedure.

The bill is a result of and largely based on the findings and recommendations of the recently published subcommittee report on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act. The report points up the needed improvements to the act, among which are first, legislative clarity for proper administration; second, language to insure uniformity in interpretation, application, and enforcement by various Government agencies; and, third, a formal review procedure which would afford

an appeal from a decision of the Secretary of Labor as a matter of right.

The bill would clarify some of the language found to be ambiguous: "Laborers and mechanics," "city, town, village, or other civil subdivisions of a State," "projects of a character similar to the contract work," "employed directly upon the site of the work." The bill would remove the present uncertainty and lack of uniformity in the interpretation and enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act among the various Federal agencies by centralizing enforcement functions in the Department of Labor. A Davis-Bacon Appeals Board would be established to provide impartial review to interested parties on determinations made by the Secretary of Labor. The Board would be composed of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The members would serve for terms of 3 years. Other changes made in the Davis-Bacon Act by the bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor to impose debarments for a discretionary rather than an absolute period of time as is now required under the Davis-Bacon Act and would allow a contractor to be removed from the debarred bidders list upon a showing by the contractor of present responsibility.

Enactment of the amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, as proposed in my bill, should solve many of the problems that have arisen in the implementation and interpretation of the act. The subcommittee will hold hearings on the bill later in the session.

ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921 by providing for its more effective operation. I have been concerned for some time about the need to plug loopholes and to improve procedures with regard to its administration.

As we know, the purpose of the Antidumping Act is to prevent a foreign manufacturer from disposing of merchandise in the United States at prices bearing little relation to its true costs of production. Dumping takes place when merchandise is sold in this country at prices below those charged in the exporting country; in other words, as the law specifies, when it is sold "at less than fair value."

Our Antidumping Act and those of other major trading countries are specifically authorized by the International General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and are in consonance with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Historically, the threat of dumping and its destructive effects has existed for many years. An unfair international trade practice which

followed closely upon the industrial revolution, it is pertinent to note that dumping was complained about by Alexander Hamilton in 1791 in his "Report on the Subject of Manufacturers" and the threat of dumping has continued to plague legitimate competition to the present day.

It is high time that this unfair international trade practice be stopped. To do so, however, several serious inadequacies which militate against this objective must be overcome. Procedural and technical overhaul is vitally needed and administrative interpretations, which at times have frustrated the purpose of the act, have tended to contravene the intent of Congress.

Clearly, remedial action to curb injurious price discrimination in world trade is not a partisan matter. It is, on the other hand, a significant issue on which groups with widely divergent interests can and, in fact, have joined in efforts to stamp out its cancerous effects. Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, capital and labor, domestic manufacturers and importers—in fact, all Americans devoted to the perpetuation of the private enterprise system upon which our economy has flourished—should press for consideration of this amendment by the Committee on Ways and Means and, I would hope, for its enactment by the House and Senate at this session.

It should be stressed that an identical bill to the one which, after careful consideration, I am introducing today was introduced prior to his recent and untimely death by our colleague, the respected and distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. Walter, and it is most heartening to note that, included among the 23 Republicans and Democrats who have sponsored the amendment in the House as of this date, six are members of the Committee on Ways and Means. The bipartisan nature of the proposed amendment is further exemplified and the substantive worth of its provisions is given added weight by the fact that a similar bill has been cosponsored by 27 Senators, seven of whom are members of the Senate Committee on Finance.

It is my understanding that one of Mr. Walter's last official acts was to direct a request to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], in which Mr. Walter reaffirmed his long-standing conviction as to the need to amend the Antidumping Act without further delay. In urging Chairman MILLS to introduce an identical bill, Mr. Walter expressed his firm hope that the proposed amendment be given early consideration and endorsement by the committee in order to permit sufficient time for necessary action to be taken by both Houses of Congress.

In view of the overriding importance of this legislation to the fair and equitable conduct of international trade, in view of the intensive review and deliberation which have characterized the development of the proposed bill, and in

view of honoring the resonant and oft-repeated request of a great American who served this body with such distinction for 30 years, I am introducing this amendment to the Antidumping Act today. In so doing, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me in introducing and supporting similar bills in order that adequate consideration may be given its provisions by the Committee on Ways and Means in the near future. I know that many of you share Mr. Walter's fervent wish that we enact a sound and workable measure of this type which will improve the effective operation of the Antidumping Act. It was his hope and it is mine that this laudatory objective may be achieved before the close of this session of the Congress.

SUPERSONIC COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the President has sent up a communication in which he is requesting Congress to provide a program to initiate the development and construction of supersonic commercial transport aircraft. There has been a lot said about this program for the last several weeks. Consideration has been given to the advisability of this type of aircraft for the last 5 or 6 years.

I think this is a most important program in view of the fact that a joint undertaking by the British and the French is in process of developing such a commercial aircraft. Our committee will hold hearings on this request and we will develop the authority and to just what extent there is present authority under the law.

We will initiate these hearings Thursday afternoon at which time we will go fully into this program with a view as to what we should do and how we should do it in the best interest of our country and continued leadership in the aviation community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the executive communication may be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

June 14, 1963.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Congress has laid down national aviation objectives in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. These include the development of an air transportation system which will further our domestic and international commerce and the national defense. These objectives, when viewed in the light of today's aviation challenges,

clearly require the commencement of a national program to support the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft which is safe for the passenger, economically sound for the world's airlines, and whose operating performance is superior to that of any comparable aircraft.

Our determination that the national interest requires such a program is based on a number of factors of varying weight and importance:

A successful supersonic transport can be an efficient, productive commercial vehicle which provides swift travel for the passenger and shows promise of developing a market which will prove profitable to the manufacturer and operator.

It will advance the frontiers of technical knowledge—not as a byproduct of military procurement, but in the pursuit of commercial objectives.

It will maintain the historic U.S. leadership in aircraft development.

It will enable this country to demonstrate the technological accomplishments which can be achieved under a democratic, free enterprise system.

Its manufacture and operation will expand our international trade.

It will strengthen the U.S. aircraft manufacturing industry—a valuable national asset—and provide employment to thousands of Americans.

The cost of such a program is large—it could be as great as \$1 billion for a development program of about 6 years. This is beyond the financial capability of our aircraft manufacturers. We cannot, however, permit this high cost, nor the difficulties and risks of such an ambitious program to preclude this country from participating in the logical next development of a commercial aircraft. In order to permit this participation, the United States, through the Federal Aviation Agency, must proceed at once with a program of assistance to industry to develop an aircraft.

The proposed program, though it will yield much technological knowledge, is principally a commercial venture. Its aim is to serve, in competition with others, a substantial segment of the world market for such an aircraft. While the magnitude of the development task requires substantial Government financial participation, it is unwise and unnecessary for the Government to bear all of the costs and risks. Consequently, I propose a program in which (1) manufacturers of the aircraft will be expected to pay a minimum of 25 percent of the development costs, and, in addition, (2) airlines that purchase the aircraft will be expected to pay a further portion of the Government's development costs through royalty payments.

The requirement for cost sharing by the manufacturers will assure that the cost of the program will be held to the absolute minimum. In no event will the Government investment be permitted to exceed \$750 million. Moreover, the Government does not intend to pay any production, purchase, or operating subsidies to manufacturers or airlines. On the other hand, this will not exclude consideration by the Government of credit assistance to manufacturers during the production process.

Although the Government will initially bear the principal financial burden in the development phase, participation by industry as a risk-taking partner is an essential of this undertaking. First, the development of civil aircraft should be a private enterprise effort, a product of the interaction of aircraft manufacturers and their prospective customers. We wish to change this relationship as little as possible, and then only temporarily. If the Government were the

full risk-taker, the degree of control and direction which it would have to give to the program, to the expenditure of funds, to the selection of designs, to the making of technical decisions, would of necessity be too great. If however, private industry bears a substantial portion of the risk, the degree of Government control and the size of the Government staff required to monitor the program can be held to a minimum.

Second, our objective is to build a commercially sound aircraft, as well as one with superior performance characteristics. This will require, at a relatively early stage, a determination whether the aircraft's cost and characteristics are such that it will find a commercial market. This is a difficult task, and our decision that we have succeeded in developing such a commercially sound aircraft will, in large measure, be attested to by industry's willingness to participate in the risk taking.

If at any point in the development program, it appears that the aircraft will not be economically sound, or if there is not adequate financial participation by industry in this venture, we must be prepared to postpone, terminate, or substantially redirect this program.

Our first concern, however, must be to get the program launched. I am convinced that our national interest requires that we move ahead in this vital area with a sound program which will develop this aircraft in an efficient manner. For that reason I commend this proposal to your early attention.

I will shortly submit to the Congress a request for funds to meet the immediate requirements of this program, such as the detailed design competition. Then we will be started on the task of marshaling the funds of Government and the ingenuity and management skills, as well as funds, of American industry to usher in a new era of commercial flight.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

REPORT ON PARIS AIRSHOW AND MEETING WITH
BRITISH/FRENCH OFFICIALS

Mr. HARRIS. Last week I had the privilege of traveling with three members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and two members of the Appropriations Committee to Paris, France. We made the trip aboard one of the FAA's C-135 flying laboratories. The purpose of our trip was to observe the inflight procedures of this aircraft as it checked the accuracy of the navigation aids used to guide our commercial and military aircraft on their flights along the airways of the world.

It also gave us the opportunity to visit the Paris International Air Show. Here, where most of the latest aircraft produced in the world were on display, we had an opportunity to observe firsthand the spectacular advances made by European aircraft manufacturers during the past few years.

We also held a meeting with the principal executives of the French SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp., to discuss their plans for the joint production of the British/French supersonic Concorde commercial transport aircraft. This airplane, which is being financed jointly by the French and British Governments, developed and built jointly by the French SUD Aviation Co., and the British Aircraft Corp., will probably fly twice the speed of

sound, have a range of some 3,250 nautical miles, carry approximately 104 passengers, and have the capability of flying nonstop between London or Paris and New York in approximately 3 hours.

This is no paper airplane. Tooling has already begun and the first prototype is scheduled to fly in 1966.

I will discuss our meeting with the representatives of these two companies, and describe in some detail the information we were able to gather. But first, I should like to remark briefly on the operations of the FAA C-135 jet aircraft in which we made our trip. The FAA operates two of these large four-engine jets which are a version of the 707. They are packed with highly complex electronic equipment which is able to check the accuracy of the radio navigation stations which guide planes by signals from the ground. The tasks they perform are truly prodigious. As an example, in our 7-hour, 15-minute flight between Washington, D.C., and Le Bourget Airport in Paris, France, we checked the accuracy of the ground navigation aids, in a band 300 miles wide, along the path of our flight while over the American Continent. When flying over the air routes of the North Atlantic, we checked the accuracy and strength of the communications and radar facilities on Ocean Ship Charlie and Ocean Ship Juliet.

Although the FAA has only two of these aircraft, they have a schedule which requires the flight checking once every 6 months of the ground navigation aids used for guiding our civil and military jet aircraft along the air routes throughout the United States and the areas of the free world into which our aircraft fly. While we remained in Paris to meet with the representatives of the French SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp., this aircraft flew on to Germany where it flight checked the navigation facilities at three major U.S. Air Force Bases.

The SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp. had gathered representatives of their top management for our meeting. Our discussions were wide-ranging, candid, and frank. It soon became entirely apparent that in spite of any problems the British and French may be having about the admittance of Britain to the European Common Market there was no discord between the two nations or these two companies in their cooperative efforts to produce the Concorde supersonic civil transport airplane.

We found that a great deal of work has been accomplished already. The program has been underway for over 18 months. Most of the basic engineering has been completed. An engine capable of producing the speed range at which the Concorde has been designed to fly is an actuality. Certain long-lead items such as castings for the main landing gear are now being fabricated. The complete details as to which company will fabricate each part and where it will be assembled into complete airplanes has been determined. The companies have

embarked on an intensive sales campaign. Our indications are that cooperative efforts between the two nations to pool technical and economic resources to capture 30 years of U.S. preeminence in aviation will continue and intensify.

Projects of such magnitude as Concorde by necessity require Government support. No manufacturer or combination of manufacturers in any country could finance the total research and development costs of a supersonic transport airplane.

We learned that the development cost for Concorde is now estimated to be approximately \$425 million. This would give them two flying prototype models, one to be assembled in Britain, and one to be assembled in France. They were quite candid, however, in admitting that this sum was an estimate and that research and the developmental costs of any aircraft, particularly one entering areas yet unknown, had an alarming habit of rising beyond predicted levels.

At this time there is no reason to believe that if we begin our supersonic program with all due haste that the Concorde will be seen more on our domestic airways than aircraft which bear the label "Made in U.S.A." but the threat is there, it is real, and it will grow more real with every delay on our part.

Our airlines will and must buy the best product they can get at the lowest possible price consistent with safety requirements when it makes economic sense to do so. This is true whether that product be of United States or foreign manufacture. So far as the economics of airline operation is concerned, it matters very little in what country the airplane is manufactured. The airlines will buy airplanes, regardless of who builds them, which are designed to make fare levels both acceptable to the traveler or the shipper and profitable to them.

The challenge to the U.S. aviation industry is not solely confined to the area of supersonic aircraft. At Le Bourget—first ground that Lindbergh touched after his historic 33½-hour flight from Long Island in 1927—we saw assembled a stunning display of tangible evidence of the tremendous strides the nations of the world have made in the technology of flight. After an inspection of these exhibits, it is obvious that no one nation can claim preeminence in creativity. Many foreign manufacturers and Governments, including Poland and Czechoslovakia, participated in the show. The products they had on display were of excellent or superior design and workmanship.

It was also obvious that the efforts of the Europeans to capture potential markets was not confined to the British/French Concorde supersonic transport effort. For example, the one aircraft in the world now flying and ready for the market which appears to come closest to meeting our requirements for a replacement for the DC-3 is French built,

At the Paris Air Show we saw evidence on every hand that the U.S. aviation industry must redouble its efforts to retain its preeminence in the aviation field. A part of the European effort to topple us from our lead position is the pooling of resources, both financial and technical. The first major example of this is, of course, the agreement between the British/French to jointly build the Concorde supersonic transport. There were a number of other cooperative projects. I found particularly revealing the cooperation of the British, French, German, and in some instances, U.S. companies, in funding and developing certain military aircraft and components. This was undoubtedly the result of the long and vast U.S. effort to promote the maximum effectiveness of the NATO nations for the benefit of the free world.

This Nation can be very proud of the U.S. products and aircraft displayed at the airshow. The United States leads in number of aircraft on exhibit with a total of 55. However, the number of foreign aircraft on exhibit this year is much larger and more varied than it was 2 years ago. Those of us who had the opportunity to view the products and aircraft on display and discuss with SUD Aviation and the British Aircraft Corp. representatives the Concorde program have been made forcefully aware that in the past decade Europe has produced a new era of prosperity and a vastly increased technical competence and capability. This prosperity and capability has now become a major and ever-present challenge to our position and stature in world aviation. We must face up squarely to this fact and take the measures necessary to retain our 30-year preeminence.

If we delay or are indecisive we may well find that the United States has become a follower rather than the leader in world aviation.

We must not allow this to happen.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may be interested, I include a summary of the action in the appropriation bills down to date in the current session and an approximation of the portions of the President's obligational authority budget yet to come before the House for consideration. It is a revision of similar information presented earlier in the session.

Summary of the appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of June 15, 1963

[NOTE.—Excludes permanent appropriations. And does not include any "backdoor" appropriations.]

Fiscal year and bill	Budget estimates to House	House action		Budget estimates to Senate	Passed by Senate	Enacted	Bills at latest stage compared to budget request
		Reported by committee	Passed				
FISCAL 1963							
Supplemental, Agriculture (shifted from original 1964 budget request)							
Supplemental, 1963	1 \$508,172,000	\$508,172,000	\$508,172,000	\$508,172,000	\$508,172,000	\$508,172,000	
Public works acceleration	1,641,507,106	988,756,506	1,438,691,506	1,652,300,456	1,488,683,841	1,467,430,491	—\$184,869,965
All other	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(—50,000,000)
	(1,141,507,106)	(988,756,506)	(988,691,506)	(1,152,300,456)	(1,038,683,841)	(1,017,430,491)	(—134,869,965)
Total, 1963	2 2,149,679,106	1,496,928,506	1,946,863,506	2,160,472,456	1,996,855,841	1,975,602,491	—184,869,965
FISCAL YEAR 1964							
Interior and related:							
Appropriations	998,009,000	929,660,200	922,625,200	998,009,000	979,693,400		—18,315,600
Borrowing authority	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	13,000,000	6,000,000		—7,000,000
Contract authority	17,500,000			17,500,000			—17,500,000
Total, Interior	1,028,509,000	935,660,200	928,625,200	1,028,509,000	985,693,400		—42,815,600
Treasury-Post Office and related	6,146,842,000	5,997,026,000	5,997,026,000	6,146,842,000	6,069,466,250	6,045,466,000	—101,376,000
Labor-HEW and related	5,739,489,000	5,449,988,000	5,449,981,000				—309,508,000
Agriculture and related:							
Appropriation	6,368,755,000	5,979,457,000	5,979,457,000				—389,298,000
Borrowing authority	855,000,000	855,000,000	855,000,000				
Total Agriculture	7,223,755,000	6,834,457,000	6,834,457,000				—389,298,000
Legislative (excludes Senate items)	148,580,245	140,038,919	140,038,919				—8,541,326
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and related	2,169,891,900	1,851,269,900					—308,622,000
Grand total reductions to date on portions of budget processed through the regular appropriation bills (based on latest action on each bill)	24,616,746,251						—1,345,030,891

1 Shifted from budget for 1964 (which was reduced accordingly).

2 This accounts for virtually all the supplementals for 1963 specifically projected in

the January 1963 budget except the \$2,000,000,000 borrowing authority for the Export-Import Bank submitted as a "backdoor" proposition and now pending.

Mr. Speaker, we will report the defense bill this week. Hearings on the other bills are either complete or well advanced. Some bills are delayed pending consideration of the related annual authorization bills which under the rules must precede the appropriation bills.

There are no further supplemental bills for fiscal 1963. There is pending, however, a \$2,000,000,000 back-door appropriation in the bill for the Export-Import Bank. As may be noted from the table included, the House has considered \$24,616,746,251 of the new appropriation budget requests for fiscal 1964 in the six regular bills reported to date.

AMOUNTS YET TO BE CONSIDERED

The President's January budget proposed \$107,927,000,000 in new obligatory authority for fiscal 1964, of which \$11,781,000,000 is for permanent appropriations recurring under prior law, principally interest on the debt, thus leaving in round figures, \$96,146,000,000 proposed for consideration in the present session applicable to fiscal 1964. The President has subsequently submitted several revisions to the January budget for fiscal 1964 totaling approximately \$1,123,000,000 in reductions, principally the \$508,172,000 agriculture item switched over to fiscal 1963 and the \$419,700,000 downward revision in foreign aid; there are approximately \$195,000,000 in other downward adjustments. Thus the current total new obligatory authority proposed by the President for 1964 for action in the current session is, again approximately, \$95,023,000,000. And the January budget identifies about \$2,727,000,000 of that—the figure has not since materially changed—with propositions of legislation for new programs initially for consideration in legislative rather

than appropriation bills; therefore it remains uncertain how much of that will eventuate in formal budget requests for actual appropriation. And some portion of the remaining \$92,296,000,000 will probably also be affected as the Congress processes the annual legislative authorization bills for such major items as space, military construction, and foreign aid; any change will presumably also affect the budget request for actual appropriation.

So that, Mr. Speaker, while we cannot, even at this date, give the precise budget amounts yet to come before the House in the appropriation bills, on the basis of what is now pending before the committee the magnitude and character is approximately this: Defense bill \$49,014,000,000; independent offices bill, \$14,560,000,000; public works bill, \$4,558,000,000; military construction, \$1,978,000,000; foreign aid bill, \$4,840,000,000; District of Columbia bill, \$34,000,000; and, as usual, a closing supplemental bill, amounts now unknown.

Mr. Speaker, a precautionary word for anyone who may take the time to balance out these figures with the budget totals. The budget concept of new obligatory authority is slightly different from the traditional appropriation concept—for instance, an appropriation to liquidate prior contract authority is counted as an appropriation but it is not new obligatory authority. And whereas in the foregoing tabulation the Post Office appropriations are counted, as heretofore, on a gross basis, in the budget only the estimated postal deficit, chargeable to the General Treasury, and being the excess of the appropriations over the estimated postal revenues, is reflected as new obligatory authority.

REVISED SUMMARY OF NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY REQUESTED BY THE PRESIDENT

For the fiscal year 1963, ending this month, the President's January budget estimated total new obligatory authority, including supplementals to be submitted to the present session, aggregating \$103,192,000,000. Subsequent revisions from the President thus far increase that figure by the net amount of approximately \$272,000,000—to a new total of \$103,464,000,000; there have been formal downward revisions of \$236,495,000, more than offset by the \$508,172,000 switch to fiscal 1963 from the 1964 budget for the Commodity Credit Corporation. A few small increases submitted by the President and not specifically identified in the January budget for fiscal 1963 are chargeable to the contingency allowance within the overall total.

For the fiscal year 1964, the revised total new obligatory authority request, after adjustments as noted, is approximately \$106,804,000,000; that is, the original January budget of \$107,927,000,000 reduced by the adjustments of \$1,123,000,000.

Comparatively, then, the President's adjusted recommendations for new authority to obligate the Government for fiscal 1964 are as follows:

1964 total budget request exceeds currently adjusted 1963 total by	+ \$3,340,000,000
1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1961 by	+ 20,129,000,000
1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1954 by	+ 44,039,000,000

And as previously documented, using official budget and Treasury figures, approximately 53 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1963, is for "Other than national defense"; approximately 49 percent of the recommended

increase, 1954 over 1961, is for "Other than national defense"; and approximately 60 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1954, is for "Other than national defense."

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY VERSUS BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker, we have said this before but when reciting these fantastic amounts it is well to repeat that a source of much confusion is the matter of just what set of figures correctly measures the size of the budget on which the Congress acts. Contrary to widespread impression, the House does not act directly on the more generally familiar \$98,802,000,000 January spending budget for fiscal 1964 which, incidentally, is now slightly outdated though it is the last official estimate from the President. The House acts on the new obligatory authority budget of \$107,927,000,000 for 1964—that is the 1964 total of the propositions submitted, and currently revised to about \$106,804,000,000. The grant of authority to obligate is the significant point of decision in the appropriation process. The actual expenditure in payment of the obligation necessarily follows in due course of time. If you do not appropriate, no obligation can be created. If no obligation is created, then no expenditure—disbursement—is made. The \$98.8 billion spending budget is the checking account budget—it represents the checks drawn to pay the bills. The new obligatory authority budget represents the authority to create the obligation. That is the key figure to keep in mind. An increasingly higher obligatory authority budget and appropriation signifies, inevitably, a higher disbursement or expenditure budget.

Members of the House, the press, and others from time to time during the year, and especially in the closing weeks and days of the session, inquire as to what Congress has done to the spending budget. Unfortunately, we cannot tell them because the figures are not available. And they cannot be precisely and authoritatively compiled here. The House will have opportunity to vote on only approximately \$44,668,000,000 of the \$98,802,000,000 spending budget figure for fiscal 1964—principally for two reasons. And even this diminished total will be fragmented among some 14 or 15 appropriation bills and numerous legislative bills, handled on a piecemeal basis throughout the session. About \$42,353,000,000 of the spending in 1964 will be from obligatory authority already voted in past years by previous Congresses. Then, roughly \$11,781,000,000 will ensue from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session. These total \$54,134,000,000, or over 54 percent of the 1964 spending budget of \$98.8 billion not directly before the House this session.

As to the remainder, a portion is related to propositions of new legislation first for consideration in sundry bills in the legislative committees, or, on the other hand, if such be the decision, to be cut from the budget by failure to report

or enact the new proposals. The separately identifiable January budget total for these new propositions of legislation, within the \$107.9 billion total new obligatory authority request is \$2,727,000,000 of new obligatory authority for fiscal 1964, of which, according to the budget, \$1,202,000,000 would be expended in 1964 and therefore included in the \$98.8 billion bill spending figure for 1964.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. LENNON), for 15 days, on account of illness.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a message by him to the World Food Conference.

Mr. GOODLING to insert the Memorial Day exercises which took place on the national cemetery at Gettysburg on Memorial Day, and include the remarks of the Vice President of the United States.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 603. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 13, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Mel-born Keat;

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I want to point out that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] made a speech earlier today in which he objected to the printing of certain agricultural bulletins and yearbooks, and said that the Congress could save a lot of money if we refused to send them out. He is asking permission to extend his remarks in five instances. Already this year he has included enough material in the RECORD to total \$13,000 plus. It seems to me that if he really wanted to save money he ought to cut down that way and not try to cut down on useful publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. What happened to this bill that was under suspension, H.R. 4638?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the bill was not called up.

Mr. GROSS. I submit that it is an unusual procedure, in light of the fact that it is 1:20 o'clock in the afternoon, to abandon the last bill scheduled for consideration under suspension. This bill was put on the whip notice on both sides of the aisle to be called up this afternoon. Moreover, I have been hearing the last few days that it was in the nature of an emergency to get the bill under consideration on the floor. I do not understand why this bill, H.R. 4638, is being shelved when an afternoon remains in which to consider it.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been withdrawn and there is nothing unusual about that. It is not an unusual situation.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr.

SHORT] that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter in five instances.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I revise the request to one instance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. The gentleman from Texas was on the floor this morning and could have made his request at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will object to all of these second-hand requests.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these requests for permission to insert remarks and material in the Appendix of the daily RECORD will all be objected to, I will not mention any more of the requests.

REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL] may address the House for 30 minutes on June 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

POINT OF ORDER OF NO QUORUM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

933. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the April 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

934. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to the development of an air transportation system which will further our domestic and international commerce and the national defense, which includes the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

936. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

937. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to indictment after dismissal of a defective indictment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

938. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 12, 1963, the following bill was reported on June 14, 1963:

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes: without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 17, 1963]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2827. A bill to extend until June 30, 1966, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2651. A bill to extend for 1 year the period during which responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children, under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, may be exercised by a public agency other than

the agency administering such aid under the State plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6246. A bill relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 392. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 12, 1963, the following bill was introduced on June 14, 1963:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred June 17, 1963]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7064. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 7065. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, in computing annual income for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain pensions, certain payments received on account of disability shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 7066. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7067. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to permit civil actions for damages in the case of water pollution affecting fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 7068. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7069. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 7070. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which construction funds must be received, and to put the National Cultural Center on a sound, businesslike basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 7071. A bill to amend section 3012 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment to those survivors not entitled to death compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or death pension, compensation and pension accrued to a veteran at the time of his death and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7072. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to assure fairness in editorializing by radio and television station licensees in support of or in opposition to candidates for public office by making the equal opportunities provisions of section 315 applicable thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 7073. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7074. A bill to amend paragraph 1537 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7075. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7076. A bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 7077. A bill to facilitate the transmission in the mails of certain educational kits containing laboratory apparatus for the use of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7078. A bill to amend section 415 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the exclusion from annual income in entitlement determinations to dependency and indemnity compensation of those amounts paid by a dependent parent for medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 7079. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans in existence and to authorize the loan of a naval vessel to a friendly foreign country and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7080. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 7081. A bill to amend section 21 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 887), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7082. A bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution congratulating the American Veterinary Medical Association on its centennial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 404. Resolution extending greetings and felicitations of the House of Representa-

tives to the people of Millbury, Mass., on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of their community; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing thanks for courtesies extended to Chaplain Alphonso Jordan on his recent visit to the Nation's Capital, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Elsie Anita Jardim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian A. Barsoum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel Whittaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Cicco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Esber, Sabahat, and Sumru Koprucu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 7090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hala Cervonogura Wolfe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7091. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioannis Tsakiris (husband), Thomaes Dimitrios Tsakiris (wife); and two children, Ioannis and Athina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Renato Magliocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Alfred Stewart McCorkle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Reginaldo Salvatore Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

159. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. D. Brownell, president, National Association of Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Contractors, Washington, D.C., relative to requesting that the utmost be done toward opposing the enactment of Senate bill 757 and House bill 2029, and that continued support be given the Small Business Administration programs which have done so much to aid the small businessman in the construction industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

160. Also, petition of Joseph Scaramella, chairman, Board of Supervisors of Mendocino County, Calif., relative to expressing support for Senate bill 1275, relating to Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

Rev. C. S. Mueller, pastor, the Lutheran Church of St. Andrew, Wheaton, Md., offered the following prayer:

Into your hands, most blessed Lord, we once more place, in prayer, our Nation, our leaders, and our people, asking for your continued care.

We this day give thanks for the abundance of your many blessings, especially those of freedom, plenty, and opportunity. Undeserving as we are of these gifts, You have graciously given into our hands all that is necessary, that we might truly "have life and have it more abundantly." May we use, and never abuse, these gifts.

In this spirit of thanksgiving and humble acknowledgment, we make bold to ask that today and every day these mercies be renewed and placed at the disposal of this Nation, her people, and her leaders, with the matching grace of wisdom, courage, understanding, and true sympathy. May what You have given to us touch the lives of all men, for good, through us.

Upon this Senate and all who work that decisions here made be just, beneficial, and effective, let your spirit of guidance rest. May the men and women who deal so intimately and directly with the destiny of our Nation and our world know the peace of calling You Father and the assurance of being your child.

These things we ask in the name of our Redeemer, Jesus Christ, through whom we have the privilege, in prayer, of calling on You for more and more, and yet more. Hear us, we humbly pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 13, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the